

sources of their information, then we are entering dangerous territory for a democracy, because that is when citizens will fear persecution simply for stepping out of the shadows to expose wrongdoing. When that happens, the information our citizens need to govern will be degraded—making it more and more difficult to hold accountable those in power.

And when the public's right to know is threatened, then all of the other liberties that we hold dear are threatened.

We are under no illusions as to the difficulty of our task in advancing this legislation.

We know that there are those who have a pavlovian response to words like "reporter" and may react negatively to this legislation. We also understand that it is critically important that we balance our Nation's compelling interest in preserving the free flow of information with its no less compelling interest in pursuing wrongdoing by criminals and others that would jeopardize the freedoms that we cherish as Americans.

Mr. President, again, I am joined by Senator LUGAR and my colleagues in the House, Congressmen SPENCE and BOUCHER. We would like to see some legislation at least be debated on the floor of the Senate and possibly passed by both Houses, if we have a chance to debate this.

The fact that reporters are going to jail because of their refusal to identify confidential sources ought to raise the concerns of everyone, regardless of their ideology or politics. We all understand there is a danger in this if we lose what has been critical as part of our self-governance. This evening, with two reporters we know facing very serious jail sentences, with others who may face similar sentences, with some 20 other people who have either been convicted or presently are in the process, we think it is very important that we act in this matter. We know it is not necessarily popular. This is not about reporters, it is not about the press, it is about whether the citizenry is going to have access to information they deserve to get. It is not about protecting journalists or sources if that is the only way we can get information we need to pursue criminal prosecutions. It ought not to be the first arrow drawn out of the prosecutor's quiver trying to deal with these matters. Too often that happens. They need to work harder to get to the bottom of these cases, without dragging the reporters in front of these courts.

I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle—conservatives, liberals, independents, moderates, or whatever—would be able to come together around this idea that in a free society of the 21st century the confidentiality of sources is something we ought to be willing to stand up and support. I urge my colleagues to consider this legislation and the leadership to put it on the calendar.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING CHAMPION GOLFER MICHAEL CAMPBELL

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to a resolution I will submit honoring a true champion. I rise today out of two affections in my life: one for the land of New Zealand, and another grows out of my enjoyment of the game of golf.

Ten days ago, on June 19, Michael Campbell became the first New Zealander to win one of the United States Golf Association's major championships in 43 years, besting a field of the world's most talented golfers.

Mr. Campbell showed great perseverance and mettle throughout the Open, mastering an immensely challenging course. He was also the first player to come from behind to win a U.S. Open in 7 years.

Mr. Campbell's win is yet another chapter in a proud tradition of excellence in international sports for New Zealand.

The Kiwis have won two of the last three America's Cup yacht races and netted three gold and two silver medals at last summer's Olympic Games in Athens.

The competitive spirit and success of these athletes is reflective of the bravery and skill of New Zealand's indigenous seagoing explorers, the Maori, of whom Michael Campbell is a descendant.

Mr. Campbell's victory in the U.S. Open also provides us with the opportunity to reflect on our relationship with New Zealand and at the same time to shape the future of our friendship.

Staunch allies in the two World Wars in the 20th century, New Zealand and its people have made tremendous sacrifices and heroic efforts to help protect freedom and democracy in the world.

Those efforts continue today, as New Zealand contributes regularly to international peacekeeping operations, remains steadfast in their alliance in the fight against terrorism, and has helped to reconstruct a new, democratic Iraq.

Even though there have been some bumps in the road—the deterioration of

the Australia-New Zealand-United States alliance comes to mind—New Zealand has been a great friend and an enduring ally over the years.

It is my hope that we will continue to foster this friendship.

On that note, I commend Michael Campbell and the nation of New Zealand for this momentous victory and express arohanui to the peoples of Aotearoa, our friends in the Land of the Long White Cloud.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday I was necessarily absent from the Senate during final passage of H.R. 6, the Energy bill. I was attending the funeral of Mrs. Marcia Lieberman, the mother of my good friend and our colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN. Had I been here, I would have voted for the bill, albeit with considerable reservations.

I commend the chairman and ranking member for their hard work in crafting a bipartisan bill. But let me be clear, this bill is not perfect. All things being equal, it seeks to balance the economic needs of our country with the well-being of our environment and sets out a policy to provide Americans with a reliable and affordable supply of energy.

Overall, the Senate Energy bill is a more balanced approach to energy tax policy than the House bill. It provides just under 50 percent of the tax incentives to renewable energy and energy-efficient buildings, homes and appliances. Unfortunately, the bill also provides 50 percent of tax incentives to mature industries such as oil, gas, coal and nuclear.

The bill now includes a renewable portfolio standard, by which electric utilities must generate 10 percent of their power from renewables by 2020. In the past, I voted for a higher percentage because I believe our Nation can and should use even more renewable energy. However, the bill begins a smart, economic, and environmentally friendly path for this country to take and I am pleased that the Senate acted.

For the first time, the Senate is on record in acknowledging the existence of global warming and recognizing the need to take mandatory, market-based steps to slow, stop or reverse the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. It is a start, a baby step, but again, it puts this country on the right path and I look forward to working with my colleagues to determine the right proposals to combat these emissions. Air pollution must be reduced. Long-term exposure to toxic emissions and unhealthy air has been linked to increased risk of cancer, reduced lung function in children, and premature death of people with heart and lung disease. Asthma rates in Connecticut are over two and a half times the national average; 7.9 percent of adults and 8.9 percent of children under age 18 in Connecticut have asthma.

I am pleased the Senate included an amendment that I offered to study the

effect of electrical contaminants on the reliability of energy production systems, including nuclear power facilities. In April, 2005, the Millstone 3 nuclear power plant in Waterford, CT, automatically shut down and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, determined the cause to be a failure of a circuit card in a computerized reactor protector system. It was revealed that "tin whiskers" were present on the circuit card which led to the subsequent shutdown. Earlier this year, the January 10, 2005, edition of *Fortune* magazine had a lengthy article entitled, "Tin Whiskers: the Next Y2K Problem?" The article explained the seriousness of this problem.

Finally, I am just as pleased with a few items that were not included in the Senate bill. Unlike the House, this bill does not grant retroactive liability to producers of MTBE, a gasoline additive that my home State of Connecticut has already banned. I urge my colleagues to keep this provision out of the conference report. There is no explicit opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, although there are attempts to open that pristine land through other pieces of legislation. Finally, the Senate bill steers clear of removing environmental protections from the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Clean Water Act. Nor does the bill reduce environmental review for energy projects.

I am disappointed that H.R. 6 includes language to inventory the Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, including what is currently covered by a 23-year moratorium. Since 1982, Congress and the executive branch have prohibited new offshore leases in the OCS. While an inventory sounds benign, it is a costly endeavor that will cause irreparable harm to our coastal waters and could well set us on a slippery slope to drilling and exploration in these environmentally sensitive areas.

I am also troubled by section 381 of the underlying Senate bill that preempts state authority and gives exclusive authority to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, with regard to the siting, construction or expansion of liquefied natural gas terminals. I understand the need for increasing our supply of natural gas, but I have grave concerns over the process for siting LNG facilities. This hits close to home because there is a proposal to place a 1,200 foot long, 180 foot wide, 100 foot high LNG facility within Long Island Sound. FERC authority is also augmented by authorizing it to site transmission facilities in certain areas if a State fails to act within one year. Again, every State's authority is undercut by this provision.

I am deeply concerned that the bill terminates FERC's proposed rulemaking for Standard Market Design, SMD, while doing nothing to address FERC's actions with regard to Locational Installed Capacity, LICAP. My attempts to insert a simple sense of the Senate amendment to clarify that gov-

ernors and utility regulators throughout New England are opposed to LICAP and FERC should take their concerns and alternative proposals into account before a final ruling in September, were refused. The theoretical purpose of LICAP is to set prices that will provide an economic incentive for construction of new generation within New England. However, as proposed by FERC, LICAP will cost ratepayers more than \$14 billion over 4 years without any guarantee that new generation will be built, with no penalty for not building new generation, and with no provision for refunding payments if no generation is built. I will continue to work with my colleagues to address this unfair situation.

Finally, on the day after the price of a barrel of crude oil topped \$60 for the first time, we must recognize that this Energy bill does virtually nothing to stem the tide of rising oil, gasoline, and heating oil prices. The majority defeated efforts to even urge the administration to divert oil from filling the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, SPR, and to release oil from the SPR through a swap program.

I urge my colleagues participating in the conference to stand firm on the will of the Senate and return an energy conference report that moves our country on the path to energy security.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, last Thursday, June 23, the full Senate voted to pass amendment No. 825, the small business and farm energy emergency relief amendment of 2005, to the Energy bill, H.R. 6. I thank my colleagues for supporting my amendment. I want to also thank the cosponsors, Senators REED, SNOWE, KOHL, LEVIN, BAUCUS, JEFFORDS, HARKIN, PRYOR, SCHUMER, LAUTENBERG, KENNEDY, and LIEBERMAN.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to help small businesses and small farms struggling to make ends meet with the record high cost of energy—natural gas, heating oil, gasoline, propane, kerosene. We can do this very easily by making those small businesses eligible to apply for low-cost disaster loans through the Small Business Administration's Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program. To help small farms and agricultural businesses, Senator KOHL has included a provision making them eligible for loans through a similar loan program at the Department of Agriculture. It also includes a provision by Senator LEVIN, passed unanimously last time this was considered in Committee and the full Senate to promote the use of alternative energy sources.

The need for this type of safety net is clear. The volatile and significant rise in cost for these fuels over the past several years has threatened the economic viability and survival of many small businesses. For example, last week the spot price for oil hit a record high of \$58.90, a cost when adjusted for inflation that has not been seen in over 20 years. This is raising the price of

gasoline, with the average U.S. price now at \$2.16 per gallon, an increase of 22 cents compared to last year. The cost of home heating oil has jumped as much as 45 percent, and the natural gas market is likely to tighten over the next few months as summer cooling demand picks up. Prices are projected to continue to increase as the winter heating season boosts natural gas demand.

As we've heard in testimony after testimony, these prices hurt small manufacturers that rely heavily on natural gas and cite energy costs as one of the top three factors driving them out of business. These prices hurt farmers that rely on natural gas and propane and gasoline to run their farms and produce crops. And these prices hurt small heating fuel dealers in the northeast.

Most small companies typically have small cash flows and narrow operating margins and simply don't have the reserves to compensate for significant and unexpected spikes in operating costs. For those businesses financially harmed by the energy prices, they need access to capital to mitigate or avoid serious losses or going out of business. Commercial lenders typically won't make loans to these small businesses because they often don't have the increased cash flow to demonstrate the ability to repay the loan.

There has been a bipartisan push for this assistance in Congress twice in the past few years. In the 107th Congress, in 2001, I introduced virtually the same bill, S. 295, and was joined by 34 cosponsors to pass it in the full Senate. Of those who voted to pass the bill, 77 are still in the Senate, including 37 Republicans. Most recently, in November, during the consideration of the mega funding bill, the fiscal year 2005 Omnibus Appropriations conference report, Senator REED, as head of the Senate Northeast-Midwest Coalition, worked to have a version of this amendment adopted as part of the bill. Seventeen Senators signed a letter to chairmen STEVENS and GREGG, and ranking members BYRD and HOLLINGS requesting its inclusion. It makes no sense, but out of 3,000 pages of legislation and almost \$400 billion in spending, this assistance was not included because the administration objected. The little guy was not helped.

As frustrating as that is, and while it would have been most helpful to these businesses—from small heating oil dealers to small manufacturers—to enact the legislation in November when the prices were at an all-time high, we can still be helpful now.

In that spirit, along with my colleagues mentioned earlier, I am very pleased to have offered the Small Business and Farm Energy Emergency Relief Act of 2005, S. 269, as an amendment to that energy bill. I ask my colleagues in the Senate and House to preserve the provision in the final bill—conference—as they work out differences between the two sides.

Mr. President, we have built a very clear record over the years on how this legislation would work and why it is needed. I am glad that my colleagues have gotten behind this bill and have put us one step close to making this law in the near future. In the past, this assistance has received bipartisan support and I am glad that this year is not different.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a bipartisan letter of support and a copy of the cosponsors from past bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMONSTRATING BIPARTISAN SUPPORT OVER
YEARS

List of S. 295 cosponsors: Senators Bond, Lieberman, Snowe, Bingaman, Landrieu, Johnson, Domenici, Levin, Wellstone, Jeffords, Harkin, Schumer, Clinton, Kohl, Edwards, Leahy, Baucus, Collins, Dodd, Chafee, Bayh, Kennedy, Inouye, Daschle, Akaka, Corzine, Reed, Murray, Cantwell, Cleland, Enzi, Torricelli, Smith, and Specter.

List of those who voted to pass S. 295 and are still in the Senate: Senators Allard, Allen, Bennett, Biden, Boxer, Breaux, Brownback, Bunning, Burns, Byrd, Campbell, Carnahan, Carper, Cochran, Conrad, Craig, Crapo, Dayton, DeWine, Dorgan, Durbin, Ensign, Feingold, Feinstein, Fitzgerald, Frist, Graham, Gramm, Grassley, Gregg, Hagel, Hatch, Helms, Hutchinson, Hutchison, Inhofe, Kyl, Lincoln, Lott, Lugar, McCain, McConnell, Mikulski, Miller, Murkowski, Nelson, Nelson, Nickles, Reid, Roberts, Rockefeller, Santorum, Sarbanes, Sessions, Shelby, Smith, Smith, Stabenow, Stevens, Thomas, Thompson, Thurmond, Voinovich, Warner, and Wyden. (40 Democrats, 37 Republicans, 1 Independent)

List of signatories to approps letter: Senators Reed, Collins, Kerry, Bingaman, Specter, Leahy, Dodd, Chafee, Kennedy, Lautenberg, Jeffords, Lieberman, Bayh, Schumer, Sarbanes, Mikulski, and Clinton.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 16, 2004.

Hon. TED STEVENS,

Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,

Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,

Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRITZ F. HOLLINGS,

Ranking Member, Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS STEVENS, BYRD, GREGG AND HOLLINGS: We are writing to request you include a provision in the fiscal year 2005 Omnibus Appropriations Conference Report to make heating oil distributors and other small businesses harmed by substantial increases in energy price eligible for Small Business Administration (SBA) disaster loans. Many small businesses are being adversely affected by the substantial increases in the prices of heating oil, propane, kerosene and natural gas. The recent volatile and substantial increases in the cost of these fuels is placing a tremendous burden on the financial resources of small businesses, which typically have small cash flows and narrow operating margins.

Heating oil and propane distributors, in particular, are being impacted. Heating oil and propane distributors purchase oil through wholesalers. Typically, the distributor has 10 days to pay for the oil. The money is pulled directly from a line of credit either at a bank or with the wholesaler. Given the high cost of heating oil, distributors' purchasing power is much lower this year compared to previous years. In addition, the distributors often do not receive payments from customers until 30 days or more after delivery; therefore, their financial resources for purchasing oil for customers and running their business are limited. Heating oil and propane dealers need to borrow money on a short-term basis to maintain economic viability. Commercial lenders typically will not make loans to these small businesses because they usually do not have the increased cash flows to demonstrate the ability to repay the loan. Without sufficient credit, these small businesses will struggle to purchase the heating fuels they need to supply residential customers, businesses and public facilities, such as schools. These loans would provide affected small businesses with the working capital needed until normal operations resume or until they can restructure to address the market changes.

SBA's disaster loans are an appropriate source of funding to address this problem. The hurricanes that caused significant damage to the Gulf Coast along with the current instability in Iraq, Nigeria and Russia caused a surge in the price for oil and important refined products, especially heating fuels. The conditions restricting these small businesses' access to capital are beyond their control and SBA loans can fill this gap when the private sector does not meet the credit needs of small businesses.

A similar provision passed the Small Business Committee and Senate with broad bipartisan support during the 107th Congress when these small businesses faced substantial increase in energy prices. In addition, there is precedence for this proposal as a similar provision was enacted in the 104th Congress to help commercial fisheries failures.

Thank you for your consideration. Please find enclosed suggested draft language for the proposal. If your staff has questions about the proposal or the impacts of the current energy price increases on small businesses, please ask them to contact Kris Sarri at 224-0606.

Sincerely,

Jack Reed, John F. Kerry, Arlen Specter, Christopher J. Dodd, Edward M. Kennedy, James M. Jeffords, Evan Bayh, Susan M. Collins, Jeff Bingaman, Patrick J. Leahy, Lincoln D. Chafee, Frank Lautenberg, Joseph I. Lieberman, Charles E. Schumer, Paul S. Sarbanes, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Barbara A. Mikulski.

Mr. BAUCUS. President, I wish to explain my climate change votes. This is an important debate, and I appreciate the efforts of my colleagues to contribute substantively to our understanding of the issue and to offer solutions.

First, let me be clear that although I voted for Senator HAGEL's amendment relating to the promotion of climate change technology at home and abroad, I do not think that amendment goes far enough to address the issue of rising greenhouse gas emissions. At the very least, I would like to see more aggressive timetables and proposals for Federal action than are contained in Senator HAGEL's amendment.

At the same time, I am still not comfortable supporting the approach of Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator MCCAIN. I admire their hard work and dedication in advocating for immediate action to control U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases. They have helped to educate their colleagues, and have kept the issue on the front-burner in the Senate and made it impossible for us to ignore. And, as they have so often pointed out, the evidence that man-made greenhouse gas emissions are impacting our climate system is growing every year.

However, I am still not ready to support the mandatory cap and trade called for in their amendment that would freeze U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases at 2000 levels in 2010. I still have questions about the costs this proposal would impose on our economy, and in particular on my state that has the largest coal reserves in the lower 48. Projections vary widely, which makes it difficult to weigh costs and benefits. I also have concerns about whether we currently—or will in the immediate future—have the technological capabilities to meet the challenges of the McCain-Lieberman bill, without imposing significant costs on our economy or creating greater volatility in natural gas markets than already exists. Perhaps not in the short term, but beyond 2010, this concern only grows.

These are not trivial questions, particularly when some of our friends in the developing world will soon eclipse the industrialized nations as the largest emitters of greenhouse gases. We cannot ignore that fact, particularly as we contemplate placing a burden on our own economy that could impact our international competitiveness, while at the same time, will have little impact on overall global greenhouse gas concentrations.

I also was unable to support Senator BINGAMAN's sense of the Senate, calling on Congress to implement a mandatory program to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases soon. While I do agree that Congress should take this issue seriously and act sooner rather than later, I can't agree at this point that we are ready to enact a purely mandatory program in the short term.

Crafting truly bipartisan, comprehensive legislation to address greenhouse gas emissions will take a great deal of work that this Congress to date has avoided, except for the concerted efforts of individual Senators, like Senators MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, BINGAMAN, BYRD and HAGEL. Unfortunately, individual efforts generally are not enough on legislation this complex and far-reaching without the structure and support of a committee-led process, and encouragement from the leadership and the administration.

This must happen, and I have been encouraged to hear many of my colleagues express similar sentiments about pursuing a broader approach to developing climate change legislation,

rather than on an ad hoc basis on the Senate floor, particularly the Chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, Senator DOMENICI. This is a positive development.

Congress must act, and act in a concerted, thoughtful way. That's how we have addressed complicated environmental legislation in the past, including the Clean Air Act. But, we're talking about a potential regulatory scheme that could dwarf the scope and impact of even the Clean Air Act and is directly related to our future economic growth. We're also talking about controlling a gas—CO₂—for which we currently have no widely available, proven control technology. Implementing mandatory controls now looks to a certain extent like stepping off a cliff and hoping something breaks our fall. We need to take the time to do it right. I pledge my assistance to make this happen.

I also continue to believe that this administration must re-engage with the international community in a meaningful way. The best way to move forward in this body is concurrently with an international effort that encompasses all of the major greenhouse gas emitters—and those that will soon become the major emitters. Not only will this accelerate the technology development curve, but it will level the economic playing field. The fact that Kyoto left out much of the developing world, including China and India, was that treaty's fatal flaw. We don't need to go down that path again, and I think the world is ready to step beyond Kyoto.

As the current number one emitter of greenhouse gases, it is incumbent on the U.S. to lead, not follow, in this effort. That's why I supported Senator KERRY's sense of the Senate.

INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to explain my action today related to S. 1239, a bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. Today, with great reluctance, I asked Leader FRIST to inform me before entering any unanimous consent agreements related to consideration of this bill, which the Indian Affairs Committee reported by voice vote this morning.

S. 1239 would pencil the Indian Health Service, IHS, an Indian tribe, a tribal organization, or urban Indian organization to pay the monthly part D premium of eligible Medicare beneficiaries. The bill defines eligible beneficiaries as individuals who are Indian and who are eligible for the part D prescription drug benefit, but who do not receive any additional financial assistance made available under the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, MMA, to beneficiaries with limited incomes.

I am all for providing assistance in paying premiums for beneficiaries in financial need. We devoted a lot of time

to those provisions in the MMA. I am troubled, however, that as currently drafted, S. 1239 would permit the IHS, an Indian tribe, tribal organization, or urban Indian organization to pick and choose who will get premium assistance. Specifically, the bill would allow them to consider an eligible beneficiary's "expected drug utilization" and any other factors to determine the cost-effectiveness of paying the beneficiary's premium.

This provision might be an attempt to reflect that the IHS, tribes, and tribal organizations have limited resources. The bill language, however, raises a number of questions. First, how would the IHS and tribes determine expected drug utilization or cost-effectiveness? Would it be based on the number of drugs a person takes or the severity of illness? Second, how would they account for the fact that a beneficiary's drug needs could change dramatically with just one illness? That is the point of having insurance.

When we crafted the MMA, we were keenly aware of the potential for adverse selection—meaning that beneficiaries might wait until they need part D coverage to enroll in part D. This would have the effect of driving up the cost of the part D premium for all beneficiaries. The additional considerations currently included S. 1239 set a dangerous precedent by seemingly promoting adverse selection in the part D program. This is exactly opposite to what we sought to achieve in the MMA.

Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to work with the sponsors of S. 1239, Senators MCCAIN, DORGAN, and BAUCUS, and with members of the Indian Affairs Committee on this matter. I had hoped to accomplish that before the bill was reported out of committee. Unfortunately, that did not happen. I do not take actions such as these lightly. But I am deeply troubled that as currently drafted, S. 1239 could end up having unintended consequences for the very people it is intended to assist and for all Medicare beneficiaries.

COMBAT METH ACT OF 2005

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am proud to add my name today as a cosponsor of the Combat Meth Act of 2005, S. 103. I want to thank Senator TALENT and Senator FEINSTEIN for their leadership on this issue. I have had the opportunity to work with my colleagues on a new version of the bill that I understand will be offered in the Judiciary Committee as a substitute when the bill is marked up, and I am very pleased to support this new version of the Combat Meth Act.

Meth is a highly addictive and particularly destructive drug that can be manufactured from widely available household items. In the last 5 years, the use of this terrible drug has skyrocketed, both nationally and in my home State of Wisconsin. When I talk to prosecutors and police officers from Wisconsin, they consistently tell me that meth use is the most daunting problem they are facing. They tell me

that meth is the single most harmful drug—to addicts, families, children, communities, and the environment—that they have ever dealt with. This bill gives law enforcement officials a chance to stem the growing tide of meth use by restricting access to the cold medicines that are commonly used to make meth and by providing funds for programs that have been shown to combat the meth problem. The bill targets those who purchase over-the-counter drugs for the purpose of manufacturing meth, while still allowing law-abiding Americans to have adequate access to the cold medicines they need.

Methamphetamine is derived from pseudoephedrine, a chemical that is found in most common cold medicines. Meth "chefs" can manufacture the drug by buying large quantities of cold medicine, mixing it with other common chemicals, and heating it. This process can occur nearly anywhere and requires only limited knowledge and experience. Even beginners can easily manufacture this drug.

Given how easy it is to make, it is not surprising that meth use has been increasing rapidly. A recent report from the National Institute on Drug Abuse finds that meth use has swept across the country, starting in Southern California and moving steadily eastward. The situation has become particularly dire in the Midwest, where meth use accounts for more than 90 percent of all drug prosecutions. Literally millions and millions of individuals have reported using meth—and this trend shows no signs of slowing. Meth cases in my home State of Wisconsin have gone up 500 percent in just the last 4 years, from 101 prosecutions in 2000 to 545 in 2004. And Wisconsin is doing much better than many other Midwestern States thanks to proactive efforts by state officials in the late 1990s, before meth had taken hold, to educate communities about the dangers of meth and the need for prevention. These education and prevention efforts paid off, keeping the number of meth labs relatively low in Wisconsin compared to neighboring States, but the problem remains a very serious one.

Both the manufacture and the use of meth have devastating consequences for users and those around them. In the short-term, even occasional meth use leads to a whole host of physical and psychological problems. It causes inflammation of the heart lining, increasing the risk of heart attacks and strokes. It causes damage to the nervous system and creates abscesses on the skin. It also attacks the brain, leading to bouts of paranoia, anxiety, and insomnia.

Meth's long-term effects are even more destructive. It has highly addictive properties, quickly turning occasional users into desperate addicts. Meth addicts often go for days without eating or sleeping. They suffer from a variety of heart ailments and can sustain permanent and often irreversible